arXiv:1602.05821v1 [math.DS] 18 Feb 2016

A DICHOTOMY OF SELF-CONFORMAL SUBSETS OF $\mathbb{R}$ WITH OVERLAPS

JASMINA ANGELEVSKA AND SASCHA TROSCHEIT

Abstract. We show that self-conformal subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ that do not satisfy the weak separation condition have full Assouad dimension. Combining this with a recent results by Käenmäki and Rossi we conclude that an interesting dichotomy applies to self-conformal and not just self-similar sets: if $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ is self-conformal with Hausdorff dimension strictly less than 1, either the Hausdorff dimension and Assouad dimension agree or the Assouad dimension is 1. We conclude that the weak separation property is in this case equivalent to Assouad and Hausdorff dimension coinciding.

1. Introduction

In this article we study a family of subsets of the line $\mathbb{R}$, called *self-conformal sets*. We assume the reader is familiar with standard work on the subject of dimension theory and conformal attractors (see e.g. Falconer [4], [5], and Pesin [17]) but repeat some important results for completeness.

Definition 1.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ diffeomorphism such that there exists an open interval $\mathcal{J}_f \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\inf_{x\in\mathcal{J}_f}|Df(x)| > 0$ and $f(\mathcal{J}_f) \subset \mathcal{J}_f$. If, furthermore, there exists $0 < c < 1$ such that $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{J}_f}|Df(x)| \leq c$ we call f a* conformal contraction *(on $\mathcal{J}_f$).*

The self-conformal attractor is defined to be the unique set invariant under a finite collection of such maps that we call an iterated function system.

Definition 1.2. *Let $\mathbb{I} = \{f_i\}_{i\in\Lambda}$ be a finite collection of conformal contractions on some open interval $\mathcal{J}$, for some (finite) index set Λ. We call $\mathbb{I}$ the* self-conformal iterated function system (IFS) *and consider the unique, non-empty, and compact set F satisfying*

$$F = \bigcup_{i\in\Lambda} f_i(F).$$

This invariant set is known as the self-conformal attractor *of $\mathbb{I}$.*

The existence and uniqueness of F follows from Hutchinson [9]. If there are no overlaps in the construction, the Hausdorff dimension can be found using thermodynamic formalism, see Pesin [17] and references contained therein. If there are exact overlaps this method can be adapted to find the Hausdorff dimension, see

Date: February 19, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28A80; Secondary 37C45.

Key words and phrases. Self-conformal set, Assouad dimension, Hausdorff dimension, Ahlfors regularity, weak separation condition.

ST was supported by EPSRC Doctoral Training Grant EP/K503162/1. JA visited ST at St Andrews in April 2015 and ST visited JA at the Ss. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje in May 2015. The first visit was supported in part by the Edinburgh Mathematical Society Research Support Fund and both JA and ST thank St Andrews and Skopje for their hospitality and the EMS for financially supporting (in part) the first visit. The authors also thank Kenneth Falconer for his helpful comments on this work.

e.g. Peres et al. [16]. We are particularly interested in the case where the overlaps do not behave nicely, specifically where the *weak separation condition* does not hold. We show that the Assouad dimension of non-trivial $F \subset \mathbb{R}$, where the associated IFS does not satisfy the weak separation property, is 1. Combining this with the fact that the weak separation property implies coincidence of Assouad and Hausdorff dimension, see Käenmäki and Rossi [10], we conclude that either Hausdorff and Assouad dimension agree or the Assouad dimension is full; it equals 1. This means that the weak separation property is equivalent to Hausdorff and Assouad dimension being equal. This extends recent work by Fraser et al. [8], who considered the linear, self-similar, case.

The Assouad dimension was developed with embedding problems in mind (see Assouad [1] and [2], and Robinson [18]) and has become a tool in the study of strange attractors and fractals, see Fraser [7], Luukkainen [13], Mackay and Tyson [14], and references therein. In particular we note that the Assouad dimension behaves similarly to the Hausdorff and box-counting dimension in simple settings, for instance when the resulting attractor is Ahlfors regular, but can differ considerably once overlaps are allowed. The Assouad dimension can be heuristically described as a measurement of the maximal (relative) scaling exponent of the number of boxes one needs to cover (a neighbourhood of) a set.

Definition 1.3. *Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and let $N_\rho(E)$ be the least number of open sets of diameter at most ρ that cover E. The* Assouad dimension *of E is*

$$\dim_A(E) = \inf\Big\{\alpha : \text{ there exists } C > 0 \text{ such that } \\ \text{for all } 0 < \rho < R \text{ we have } \sup_{x\in E} N_\rho(B(x,R)\cap E) \le C\left(\frac{R}{\rho}\right)^{\alpha}\Big\}. \tag{1.1}$$

We denote the Hausdorff and box-counting dimension by $\dim_H$ and $\dim_B$, respectively. For definitions and basic properties see Falconer [4]. At this point we also remark that for self-conformal attractors, irrespective of separation conditions, the upper box counting and Hausdorff dimension coincide (see Falconer [3]). This is, of course, in contrast with our main result Theorem 2.2, where we show that lack of the weak separation property implies $\dim_A F = 1$, irrespective of $\dim_H F$.

We use a finite alphabet Λ to code points in the attractor. Let Λ be the finite index set given by the IFS. We write Λ^k to refer to the codings (or words) of length k that have entries in Λ,

$$\Lambda^k = \{w_1 w_2 \dots w_k : w_i \in \Lambda\}.$$

Similarly, we define the set of all infinite words as $\Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ and the set of all finite words as $\Lambda^* = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \Lambda^k$, where $\Lambda^0 = \{\varepsilon_0\}$ contains only the empty word ε_0. Equipped with these words we can describe composition of maps according to words. Let $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_{|w|} \in \Lambda^*$, we write

$$f_w = f_{w_1} \circ f_{w_2} \circ \cdots \circ f_{w_{|w|}},$$

where $|w|$ is the length of the word w. For $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ we similarly write

$$f_w = \lim_{k\to\infty} f_{w_1} \circ f_{w_2} \circ \cdots \circ f_{w_k}.$$

Since all the f_i are strict contractions, $f_w(x)$ maps all $x \in \mathcal{J}$ to the same point. Given two words $w \in \Lambda^*$ and $v \in \Lambda^* \cup \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ we let wv be the concatenation of the two words. The attractor is then the projection of the codings under composition

of the mappings in $\mathbb{I}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$; we have

$$F = \bigcup_{w\in\Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}} f_w(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \bigcap_{i=1}^{k} \bigcup_{w\in\Lambda^i} f_w(\Delta),$$

for all compact sets Δ such that $f_i(\Delta) \subseteq \Delta$ for all $i \in \Lambda$. To ease notation we make the assumption, rescaling and translating if necessary, that the (compact) convex hull of F is $[0,1]$ and we set $\Delta = [0,1]$. We can further assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathcal{J}$ is an ε-neighbourhood of Δ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

We exclude the trivial case where all $f \in \mathbb{I}$ share the same fixed point. Here, trivially, $\dim_A = \dim_H = 0$ and we stipulate that the are at least two maps in $\mathbb{I}$ that do not share a common fixed point. We label the rightmost fixed point $x_1 \in \Delta$ and refer to the map with this fixed point as f_1, choosing arbitrarily if there is more than one. If $\inf_{i\in\Lambda, x\in\mathcal{J}} Df_i(x) > 0$, then $x_1 = 1$. This is not the case in general, but for non-trivial IFSs we must have $x_1 > 0$.

2. The weak separation condition and main results

Many different separation conditions have been considered for IFS attractors, with the strong separation condition (SSC) and the open set condition (OSC) the most prominent. The strong separation condition is, as the name suggests, stronger than the open set condition but many results concerning the SSC can be extended, under suitable modification, to the OSC and the weak separation condition (WSP), which is a weaker condition still. It was introduced by Lau and Ngai [11] with an important alternative definition due to Zerner [19], which we refer to as the identity limit criterion (ILC). The ILC does not, in general, coincide with the WSP, but in the self-similar setting they do. While the weak separation property was introduced with self-similar sets in mind, several authors considered the self-conformal case, see [6], [10], [12], [15], [16]. In Lemma 3.3 we prove that for finite self-conformal iterated function systems of the real line the ILC is equivalent to the WSP.

The self-similar analogue of Theorem 2.2, proved in [8], makes heavy use of the ILC and in this paper we adopt their methods to the self-conformal case. Our proof sometimes closely follows, and sometimes differs from the approach in [8]. Lemma 3.6, for example, holds trivially in the self-similar setting, but needs some work for self-conformal attractors.

Let $0 < b \leq 1$ and set $\mathcal{A}_b$ to be the set of all codings such that the image under the associated mapping is of diameter comparable to b,

$$\mathcal{A}_b = \{w \in \Lambda^* : \operatorname{diam} f_{w_1w_2\ldots w_{|w|}}(\Delta) \leq b < \operatorname{diam} f_{w_1w_2\ldots w_{|w|-1}}(\Delta)\},$$

and set $\mathcal{M}_b = \{f_w : w \in \mathcal{A}_b\}$ to be the collection of (distinct) maps associated to those words.

Definition 2.1. *Let F be the attractor of the (self-conformal) iterated function system $\mathbb{I} = \{f_i\}_{i\in\Lambda}$. The IFS $\mathbb{I}$ satisfies the* weak separation property (WSP) *if there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ and a set $\mathcal{O}$ with non-empty interior such that, for all $b \in (0,1]$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\#\{f \in \mathcal{M}_b : x \in f(\mathcal{O})\} \leq \gamma.$$

We now state our main result.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the attractor of the non-trivial iterated function system $\mathbb{I}$. If $\mathbb{I}$ does not satisfy the weak separation property, the Assouad dimension is full. That is*

$$\neg\,\mathrm{WSP} \Rightarrow \dim_A F = 1.$$

The following proposition follows from the work in Käenmäki and Rossi [10] for Moran constructions.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be the attractor of a non-trivial iterated function system $\mathbb{I}$. If $\mathbb{I}$ satisfies the WSP then* $\dim_H F = \dim_A F$.

Combining Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 we obtain.

Corollary 2.4. *Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the attractor of the non-trivial iterated function system $\mathbb{I}$ and assume that* $\dim_H F < 1$. *The following are equivalent:*

(1) $\mathbb{I}$ *does not satisfy the weak separation property,*
(2) *The Assouad dimension is full, i.e.* $\dim_A F = 1$,
(3) $\dim_H F = \dim_B F < \dim_A F = 1$.

3. Proofs

We now prove the results in the preceding section. First, we define the *bounded distortion condition* and the *identity limit criterion* of Zerner, and prove that this criterion is equivalent to the weak separation property for self-conformal attractors of $\mathbb{R}$. We finish this section by proving Theorem 2.2 using *very weak pseudo tangents*, to be defined.

It is well known that self-conformal attractors satisfy the bounded distortion condition, see [5].

Definition 3.1. *The attractor F of an iterated function system $\mathbb{I}$ satisfies the* bounded distortion condition *if there exists a (uniform)* distortion constant $K > 0$ *such that for all $w \in \Lambda^*$ and all $x \in \mathcal{J}$,*

$$K^{-1} \operatorname{diam}(f_w(\Delta)) \leq |Df_w(x)| \leq K \operatorname{diam}(f_w(\Delta)).$$

Since we will be dealing with the inverses f_v^{-1}, we have to be careful about the domains. Generally speaking, we are not interested in $f_i^{-1}(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{J}$, and therefore define, for all $i \in \Lambda$,

$$f_i^{-1}(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda_r x + \lim_{x \nearrow \sup \mathcal{J}} f_i(x) - \lambda_r \sup \mathcal{J}, & \text{for } x \geq \sup \mathcal{J}; \\ y \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } f_i(y) = x, & \text{for } x \in \mathcal{J}; \\ \lambda_l x + \lim_{x \searrow \inf \mathcal{J}} f_i(x) - \lambda_l \inf \mathcal{J}, & \text{for } x \leq \inf \mathcal{J}; \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda_r = \lim_{x \nearrow \sup \mathcal{J}} Df_i(x))$ and $\lambda_l = \lim_{x \searrow \inf \mathcal{J}} Df_i(x))$. Note that this linearisation of f_i beyond $\mathcal{J}$ is well defined as all the limits exist, and $|\lambda_l|, |\lambda_r| > 0$, such that f_i^{-1} is repelling $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{J}$. Further, we restrict the domains of f_i to $\mathcal{J}$ and slightly abuse notation by writing f_v instead of $f_v|_{\mathcal{J}}$ for all $v \in \Lambda^*$. Let

$$\mathcal{E} = \{f_v^{-1} \circ f_w : v, w \in \mathbb{I}^*, v \neq w\},$$

where f_{ε_0} is the identity. We immediately see that $\mathcal{E}$ is a subset of the set of all bounded functions $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}, \mathbb{R})$, which we equip with the supremum norm $\|.\|_\infty$.

As noted above, the definition given by Zerner [19] is a very useful tool in the self-similar case, which is not equivalent to the WSP in general. Here we shall refer to it as the *identity limit criterion (ILC).*

Definition 3.2 (Identity Limit Criterion – ILC)**.** *Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}, \mathbb{R})$ be as above. We say that $\mathbb{I}$ satisfies the identity limit criterion if the identity is not a limit point of $\mathcal{E}$,*

$$\mathrm{Id} \notin \overline{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathrm{Id}}.$$

Remark. The original definition did not restrict the functions to a bounded interval and instead considered $\mathcal{E}$ as a subset of the space of all similarities $S(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, endowed with the topology $\mathcal{T}$ of pointwise convergence. Convergence in the topological space $(S(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d), \mathcal{T})$ and convergence in the Banach space $(C([0,1]^d, \mathbb{R}^d), \|.\|_\infty)$ are equivalent for similarities and our definition of the ILC coincides with the original definition by Zerner for self-similar IFS.

It turns out that for self-conformal attractors with finite IFSs the notions of WSP and ILC coincide:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathbb{I}$ be a self-conformal iterated function system of the unit line. The weak separation condition and the identity limit criterion are equivalent:*

$$\text{WSP} \Leftrightarrow \text{ILC}\,.$$

Proof. ($\neg$ILC $\Rightarrow$ $\neg$WSP) Assume for a contradiction that the WSP holds. Thus there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ and a set $\mathcal{O}$ with non-empty interior such that for all $0 < b \leq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\#\{f \in \mathcal{M}_b : x \in f(\mathcal{O})\} \leq \gamma$. It is easy to see that failure of the ILC implies that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find words $v, w \in \Lambda^*$ such that $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{O}, f_v^{-1} \circ f_w(\mathcal{O})) < \varepsilon$ and $0 < \|f_v^{-1} \circ f_w - \mathrm{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$. Then

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{J}} |f_v^{-1} \circ f_w(x) - x| < \varepsilon,$$

so $f_v^{-1} \circ f_w(x) \in (x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)$. Now f_v is a monotone continuous function and

$$f_w(x) \in f_v\left((x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)\right).$$

Both $f_v(x), f_w(x) \in \mathcal{J}$ and $f_v(x) \in f_v\left((x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)\right)$, hence

$$|f_w(x) - f_v(x)| \leq \operatorname{diam}(f_v\left((x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)\right) \cap \mathcal{J}) \leq \operatorname{diam}(f_v\left((x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)\right)).$$

Using bounded distortion and the mean value theorem,

$$\operatorname{diam}(f_v\left((x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon)\right)) \leq 2CK\varepsilon \cdot \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\Delta)).$$

where K is the distortion constant and $C = \operatorname{diam}\mathcal{J}$. We will frequently use this estimate and from now on redefine K appropriately to include C. This implies

$$0 < \|(f_v - f_w)\|_\infty \leq 2K\varepsilon \cdot \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\Delta)) \tag{3.1}$$

But then for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z_1, z_2 \in \{v, w\}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f_{z_1} - f_{z_2})\|_\infty &\leq 2\varepsilon K \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\Delta)) K^{N-1} \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\Delta))^{1-N} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon K^N \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\Delta))^{2-N}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Because $\mathcal{O}$ has non-empty interior, there exists an open interval $\widehat{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Let $\delta = \min_{z \in \{v,w\}^N} \operatorname{diam}(f_z(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}))$ and set

$$\varepsilon < \min\left\{\varepsilon', \frac{\delta \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\Delta))^{N-2}}{6K^N}\right\},$$

where $\varepsilon' > 0$ is small enough such that,

$$\overline{\tau} := \inf_{z \in \{v,w\}^N} \operatorname{diam}(f_z(\Delta)) \geq \inf_{\substack{i \in \Lambda \\ x \in \mathcal{J}}} \{Df_i(x)\} \cdot \sup_{z \in \{v,w\}^N} \{\operatorname{diam}(f_z(\Delta))\} =: \underline{\tau}.$$

So there exists $0 < \kappa \leq 1$ and $b' \in [\overline{\tau}, \underline{\tau}]$ such that

$$\#\{f_z \in \mathcal{M}_{b'} : z \in \{v, w\}^N\} \geq \kappa \#\{f_z : z \in \{v, w\}^N\}. \tag{3.3}$$

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find ε such that, for all $z_1, z_2 \in \{v, w\}^N$,

$$\|(f_{z_1} - f_{z_2})\|_\infty \leq \frac{\delta}{3} = \frac{\min_{z \in \{v,w\}^N} \operatorname{diam}(f_z(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}))}{3}.$$

This implies that

$$\bigcap_{z\in\{v,w\}^N} f_z(\mathcal{O}) \supseteq \bigcap_{z\in\{v,w\}^N} f_z(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}) \neq \varnothing. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $N > \gamma/\kappa$; by (3.4) there exists $x \in \bigcap\{f_z(\mathcal{O}) : z \in \{v,w\}^N\}$, and by (3.3) there exists b' such that

$$\#\{f \in \mathcal{M}_{b'} : x \in f(\mathcal{O})\} \geq \kappa \#\{f_z : z \in \{v,w\}^N\} \geq \kappa 2^N > \gamma,$$

contradicting the WSP. □

($\neg$ WSP $\Rightarrow \neg$ ILC)

Let $\mathcal{W} \subset \Lambda^*$ be such that for any distinct $v, w \in \mathcal{W}$ the maps f_v, f_w satisfy $f_v^{-1} \circ f_w \neq \mathrm{Id}$. In particular $\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathrm{Id}$ satisfies this condition. Let $j^+ = \sup \mathcal{J}$ and $j^- = \inf \mathcal{J}$, and define, for all $z \in \Lambda^*$, $f_z(j^+) = \lim_{x \nearrow j^+} f_z(x)$ and $f_z(j^-) = \lim_{x \searrow j^-} f_z(x)$. Clearly both limits exist. We let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the 'normalised' maps for words in $\mathcal{W}$, that is

$$\mathfrak{C} = \{(L_v \circ f_v) : v \in \mathcal{W}_i\}, \text{ where } L_v(x) = \frac{x - f_v(j^-)}{f_v(j^+) - f_v(j^-)}.$$

Thus for any $g \in \mathfrak{C}$ we have, slightly abusing notation, $g(j^-) = 0$ and $g(j^+) = 1$. Since the maps satisfy the bounded distortion condition, there exists $0 < K < \infty$, such that for all $g \in \mathfrak{C}$ and all $x \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$0 < K^{-1} \leq Dg(x) \leq K < \infty. \tag{3.5}$$

Given any sequence of collections $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\#\mathcal{W}_i \geq i$ there exist two sequences of words (v_i) and (w_i) such that

$$\left\|((L_{v_i} \circ f_{v_i})^{-1} \circ L_{w_i} \circ f_{w_i}) - \mathrm{Id}\right\|_\infty \to 0 \text{ as } i \to \infty. \tag{3.6}$$

We will prove this statement by contradiction. Assume the contrary, that is there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and any distinct $v, w \in \mathcal{W}_i$, the maps $L_v \circ f_v$ and $L_w \circ f_w$ are *ε-separated*, meaning there exists $x \in \Delta$ such that $|L_v \circ f_v(x) - L_w \circ f_w(x)| \geq \varepsilon$. Therefore there exists a neighbourhood around x of diameter at least $r_\varepsilon = \varepsilon/(K' - (K')^{-1})$, for $K' = \max\{2, K\}$, where $|L_v \circ f_v(x+r) - L_w \circ f_w(x+r)| \geq \varepsilon|r_\varepsilon - r|$ for $r \in [-r_\varepsilon, r_\varepsilon]$. This applies for any distinct $v, w \in \mathcal{W}_i$ and thus

$$\#\mathcal{W}_i \leq n_\varepsilon := \binom{2/r_\varepsilon}{1/r_\varepsilon}.$$

This bound can be obtained by considering the parallelogram with edges at slopes K and K^{-1} and opposing vertices $(j^-, 0)$ and $(j^+, 1)$. Let $a_\varepsilon = \lceil (\operatorname{diam} \mathcal{J})/r_\varepsilon \rceil$ and subdivide this parallelogram equally into a_ε by a_ε smaller parallelograms. Each path along the edges of the smaller parallelograms, starting at $(j^-, 0)$, increasing in horizontal displacement, and ending at $(j^+, 1)$ is a continuous function with slopes K or K^{-1}. Each function can be distinctly represented by a word in

$$\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon = \{e = e_1 e_2 \dots e_{2a_\varepsilon} \in \{e^+, e^-\}^{2a_\varepsilon} : \#\{i \in \{1, \dots, 2a_\varepsilon\} : e_i = e^+\} = a_\varepsilon\},$$

where e^+ represents an edge with slope K of a small parallelogram, and e^- represents the corresponding edge with slope K^{-1}. This is the most efficient way to distribute functions with slopes bounded by K and K^{-1} and any other function will be at most $\varepsilon/2$ apart from one of the functions given by words in $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$. It is elementary that $\#\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon = \binom{2a_\varepsilon}{a_\varepsilon}$, giving the bound above.

We can now pick $i > n_\varepsilon$, which implies that there are at least two maps in $\mathfrak{C}_i$ that are not ε-separated. Since ε was arbitrary we have a contradiction and (3.6) follows. Similarly, for $\varepsilon_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$, replacing L_v by similarity $L_v^{\varepsilon_i}$ that maps

$f_v(j^-)$ into $(0-\varepsilon_i, 0+\varepsilon_i)$ and $f_v(j^+)$ into $(1-\varepsilon_i, 1+\varepsilon_i)$, the convergence in (3.6) holds.

We now prove $\neg$ WSP $\Rightarrow \neg$ ILC. Assume that $\mathbb{I}$ does not satisfy the weak separation property. Let $\mathcal{A}_\gamma^+$ be the set of words (with minimal cardinality) such that there exists $b \in (0,1]$ and $x_\gamma \in \Delta$ for which

$$\#\{f_w : w \in \mathcal{A}_\gamma^+ \subseteq \mathcal{A}_b, x_\gamma \in f_w(\Delta) \text{ and } Df_w(x_\gamma) > 0\} > \gamma.$$

Similarly define $\mathcal{A}_\gamma^-$ for functions with negative derivative. The weak separation property implies that at least one of the sequences $\{\mathcal{A}_i^+\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}_i^-\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ exists. For definiteness assume $\{\mathcal{A}_i^+\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the infinite sequence, the other case follows by the same argument.

Fix $\varepsilon_i > 0$ such that $\varepsilon_i \to 0$ and choose γ_i large enough such that there are i maps whose images of Δ are ε_i close with respect to the Hausdorff metric $d_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e. there are i distinct words $v_1, \ldots, v_i \in \mathcal{A}_{\gamma_i}^+$ for which

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(f_{v_j}(\Delta), f_{v_k}(\Delta)) < \varepsilon_i \max_l\{\operatorname{diam}(f_{v_l}(\Delta))\}.$$

We refer to the collection of these words as $\mathcal{B}_i$. For each i choose $w^i \in \mathcal{B}_i$ arbitrarily and consider the set

$$\mathfrak{C}_i = \{(L_{w^i} \circ f_v) : v \in \mathcal{B}_i\}.$$

By definition L_{w^i} maps $f_{v_j}(j_-)$ into $(-\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i)$ and $f_{v_j}(j^+)$ into $(1-\varepsilon_i, 1+\varepsilon_i)$ for all j. The sequence of sets of words $\mathcal{B}_i$ satisfies all assumptions made for (3.6) and there exist a sequence $(m_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that there are at least two words in $\mathcal{B}_{m_i}$ which have associated maps that are ε_{m_i}-close. Call these $u^1_{m_i}$ and $u^2_{m_i}$. We get

$$\left\| L_{w^i} \circ f_{u^1_{m_i}} - L_{w^i} \circ f_{u^1_{m_i}} \right\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_{m_i},$$

and so, for some $c > 0$,

$$c\varepsilon_{m_i} \geq \left\| (L_{w^i} \circ f_{u^1_{m_i}})^{-1} \circ L_{w^i} \circ f_{u^1_{m_i}} - \mathrm{Id} \right\|_\infty$$
$$c\varepsilon_{m_i} \geq \left\| f^{-1}_{u^1_{m_i}} \circ f_{u^1_{m_i}} - \mathrm{Id} \right\|_\infty.$$

The required conclusion follows on noting that $\varepsilon_{m_i} \to 0$. □

3.1. **Proof of Main Theorem.** Throughout we will assume that the WSP does not hold and there exists at least one sequence $(v_i, w_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in (\Lambda^* \times \Lambda^*)^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \to \mathrm{Id}$ in $(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{J}, \mathbb{R}), \|.\|_\infty)$. Let x_i be the fixed point of f_i, for $i \in \Lambda$. Recall the x_1 is the right-most fixed point. Fix x_0 to be any other. It is evident that

$$0 \leq f_0(x_0) = x_0 < x_1 = f_1(x_1) \leq 1.$$

If there are multiple maps having fixed points x_0 or x_1, choose f_0 and f_1 arbitrarily amongst them.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists $\widehat{C} > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that for all $v \in \Lambda^*$ and $x \in \mathcal{J}$,*

$$|Df_v(x) - Df_v(y)| \leq \widehat{C}|x-y|^\beta \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\mathcal{J})). \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Write $k = |v|$. Using the chain rule repeatedly we obtain

$$Df_{v_1\ldots v_k}(x) = Df_{v_1}(x) \cdot Df_{v_2}(f_{v_1}(x)) \cdot Df_{v_3}(f_{v_2v_1}(x)) \ldots Df_{v_k}(f_{v_{k-1}v_{k-2}\ldots v_1}(x)).$$

It is a basic fact of maps satisfying the bounded distortion condition that $|f_w(x) - f_w(y)| \leq C \operatorname{diam} f_v(\mathcal{J})|x-y|$ for all $w \in \Lambda^*$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{J}$, see e.g. Falconer [5, Corollary 4.4]. Let $1 \leq j \leq k$. Fix $x \in \mathcal{J}$, then for all $y \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\ldots v_1}(y)) = Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\ldots v_1}(x) + r_j),$$

where $|r_j| \leq C \operatorname{diam} f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(\mathcal{J})|x-y|$. Now for all $i \in \Lambda$, Df_i is β-Hölder for some $\beta > 0$ and so there exists $C' > 0$ such that

$$|Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(y))| \leq |Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x))| + C'|r_j|^\beta.$$

Note that $r_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, whereas $Df_i(x) \geq K^{-1} > 0$. Therefore we can without loss of generality assume that

$$Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(y)) = Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x)) + C_j''|r_j|^\beta,$$

for some $C_j'' \in [-C', C']$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(y) &= \prod_{j=1}^{k} Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}v_{j-2}\dots v_1}(y)) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x)) + C_j''|r_j|^\beta\right) \\
&= \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k} Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x))\right)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(1 + \frac{C_j''|r_j|^\beta}{Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x))}\right)\right) \\
&= Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(x)\exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\log\left(1 + \frac{C_j''|r_j|^\beta}{Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x))}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude, for some $C_1, C_2 \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(x) - Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(y)| \\
&\leq |Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(x)| \cdot \left|\exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\log\left(1 + \frac{C'|r_j|^\beta}{Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x))}\right)\right) - 1\right| \\
&\leq |Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(x)| \cdot \left(\exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\frac{C'(C\operatorname{diam} f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(\mathcal{J})|x-y|)^\beta}{Df_{v_j}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(x))}\right) - 1\right) \\
&\leq |Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(x)| \cdot \left(\exp\left[C^\beta C'K|x-y|^\beta\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\operatorname{diam}(f_{v_{j-1}\dots v_1}(\mathcal{J}))\right)^\beta\right] - 1\right) \\
&\leq |Df_{v_1\dots v_k}(x)| \left(e^{C_1|x-y|^\beta} - 1\right) \\
&\leq K\operatorname{diam}(f_{v_1\dots v_k}(\mathcal{J}))C_2|x-y|^\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $\widehat{C} = KC_2$ completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $v, w \in \Lambda^*$ such that $\|f_v^{-1} \circ f_w - \mathrm{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$. Then there exist $\widetilde{C} > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{J}$ that satisfy $f_v^{-1} \circ f_w(x), f_v^{-1} \circ f_w(y) \in \mathcal{J}$,*

$$|D(f_v^{-1} \circ f_w)(x) - D(f_v^{-1} \circ f_w)(y)| \leq \widetilde{C}|x-y|^\beta.$$

Proof. Using the chain rule for inverses, and writing $g = f_v^{-1} \circ f_w$, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|D(f_v^{-1} \circ f_w)(x) - D(f_v^{-1} \circ f_w)(y)\right| \\
&= \left|\frac{Df_w(x)}{Df_v(g(x))} - \frac{Df_w(y)}{Df_v(g(y))}\right| \\
&= \left|\frac{Df_w(x)\cdot(Df_v(g(y))) - Df_w(y)\cdot(Df_v(g(x)))}{(Df_v(g(x)))\cdot(Df_v(g(y)))}\right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \left| \frac{(Df_v(g(y))) \cdot (Df_w(x) - Df_w(y)) + Df_w(y) \cdot (Df_v(g(x)) - Df_v(g(y)))}{(Df_v(g(x))) \cdot (Df_v(g(y)))} \right|$$
$$\leq K \left| \frac{(Df_w(x) - Df_w(y)) + (Df_v(g(x)) - Df_v(g(y)))}{Df_v(g(y))} \right|$$
$$\leq K\widehat{C} \left(\frac{\operatorname{diam}(f_v(\mathcal{J}))\,|x-y|^\beta + \operatorname{diam}(f_w(\mathcal{J}))|g(x)-g(y)|^\beta}{Df_v(g(y))} \right) \qquad \text{by Lemma 3.4.}$$

We now use the assumption that $\|f_v^{-1} \circ f_w - \mathrm{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ and so $\operatorname{diam}(f_w(\mathcal{J})) \asymp \operatorname{diam}(f_v(\mathcal{J}))$ and, redefining $\widehat{C}$ if necessary,

$$\left|D(f_v^{-1} \circ f_w)(x) - D(f_v^{-1} \circ f_w)(y)\right| \leq 2K^2\widehat{C}|x-y|^\beta,$$

as required. □

Lemma 3.6. *Given any sequences of words $(v_i), (w_i)$ such that $f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \to \mathrm{Id}$ there exists a subsequence such that $f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i}(x_1) \nearrow x_1$ from below or $f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i}(x_1) \searrow x_1$ from above.*

Proof. We first show that $(i)_i$ has a subsequence $(k_i)_i$ such that for every k_i in the sequence, $f_{v_{k_i}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_i}}(x_0) \neq x_0$ or $f_{v_{k_i}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_i}}(x_1) \neq x_1$. Assume for a contradiction there is no such subsequence. This means that there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $v_i, w_i \in \bigcup_{k \geq N} \Lambda^k$,

$$\|f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} - \mathrm{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon \Rightarrow f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i}(x_0) = x_0 \text{ and } f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i}(x_1) = x_1.$$

Hence applying the map f_1 with fixed point x_1 we get $f_1^{-1} \circ f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \circ f_1(x_1) = x_1$ and in general $f_1^{-n} \circ f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \circ f_1^n(x_1) = x_1$, however, choosing N large enough such that $\|f_1^{-1} \circ f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \circ f_1 - \mathrm{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ for $v_i, w_i \in \bigcup_{k \geq N} \Lambda^k$ implies that x_0 is also a fixed point of $f_1^{-1} \circ f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \circ f_1$, and by induction,

$$f_1^{-n} \circ f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \circ f_1^n(x_0) = x_0 \text{ and } f_1^{-n} \circ f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \circ f_1^n(x_1) = x_1.$$

But this implies that $f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} = \mathrm{Id}$ as $f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} \in C^{1+\varepsilon}$ and since our choice was arbitrary we must have $f_v^{-1} \circ f_w = \mathrm{Id}$ for all but finitely many $v \neq w \in \Lambda^*$, contradicting the WSP.

By redefining the maps, reflecting about $1/2$ if necessary, we can assume that there exists a subsequence $(k_i)_i$ satisfying $f_{v_{k_i}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_i}}(x_1) \neq x_1$ and, by choosing subsequences again we can assume $f_{v_{k_i}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_i}}(x_1) < x_1$ or $f_{v_{k_i}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_i}}(x_1) > x_1$ as required. □

Using Lemma 3.6, we now assume $(v_i, w_i)_i \in (\Lambda^* \times \Lambda^*)^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $g_i = (f_{v_i}^{-1} \circ f_{w_i} - \mathrm{Id}) \to 0$, and $g_i(x_1) \nearrow 0$. The latter claim can be made without loss of generality as the case when $g_i(x_1) \searrow 0$ can be proven by changing some of the signs in the work below; we omit details. Note that Lemma 3.5 gives us bounds on the derivative of g_i. The most extremal case satisfies $g_i(y) = -\|g_i\|_\infty$, $g_i(y + 2\delta) = \|g_i\|_\infty$, and by symmetry, $g_i(y + \delta) = 0$ for some $y \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\delta \geq 0$. We must have $Dg_i(y) = Dg_i(y + 2\delta) = 0$ and therefore $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{J}} |g_i| \leq Dg_i(y + \delta)$. Then, $(\widetilde{C}/(1+\beta))\delta^{1+\beta} = \|g_i\|_\infty$ and so

$$\delta \geq \left(\frac{\beta + 1}{\widetilde{C}} \right)^{1/(1+\beta)} \cdot \|g_i\|_\infty^{1/(1+\beta)} = \widetilde{K}_1 \|g_i\|_\infty^{1/(1+\beta)}$$

and

$$Dg_i(y + \delta) \leq \widetilde{C}\delta^\beta \leq \widetilde{K}_2 \|g_i\|_\infty^{\beta/(1+\beta)},$$

for some $\widetilde{K}_1, \widetilde{K}_2 > 0$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let (v_i, w_i) be a pair as in Lemma 3.6. There exists a sequence of (v_i, w_i) and $\tilde{c} > 0$, independent of i, such that,*

$$|g_i(x_1)| \geq \widetilde{c}\|g_i\|_\infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. Assume that for a chosen i we have $c_i := |g_i(x_1)|/\|g_i\|_\infty < \widetilde{c}$. We can then replace the words (v_i, w_i) by a different pair satisfying the conditions in Lemma 3.6, but also (3.8). Let m and $c' \geq 1$ be such that $c' \operatorname{diam}(f_1^m(\mathcal{J})) < c_i$ but $c' \operatorname{diam}(f_1^{m-1}(\mathcal{J})) \geq c_i$ and

$$\|f_1^{-m} \circ g_i \circ f_1^m - \mathrm{Id}\|_\infty \leq \|g_i\|_\infty.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(f_1^{-m} \circ g_{p_i} \circ f_1^m - \mathrm{Id})(x_1)| &= |f_1^{-m} \circ g_{p_i}(x_1) - x_1| \\
&= |f_1^{-m}(x_1 + c_i\|g_i\|_\infty) - x_1| \\
&\geq |x_1 + K^{-1} \operatorname{diam}(f_1^{m-1}(\mathcal{J}))^{-1} c_i \|g_i\|_\infty - x_1| \\
&\geq (c'K)^{-1}\|g_i\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and so $\widetilde{c} \geq (c'K)^{-1} > 0$, and we can replace (v_i, w_i) by $(v_i 1^m, w_i 1^m)$. □

Let $\rho_i = c\widetilde{K}_1 \|g_i\|_\infty^{1/(1+\beta)}$ and write

$$\xi_i(r) = \inf\{|g_i(x)| : x \in B_r(x_1)\} \text{ and } \Xi_i(r) = \sup\{|g_i(x)| : x \in B_r(x_1)\}.$$

Note the following bounds, using Lemma 3.5,

$$\xi_i(2\rho_i) \geq |g_i(x_1)| - 2\rho_i |Dg_i(x_1)| - \frac{\widetilde{C}(2\rho_i)^{1+\beta}}{1+\beta} > 0, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\xi_i(\rho_i) \geq |g_i(x_1)| - \rho_i |Dg_i(x_1)| - \frac{\widetilde{C}(\rho_i)^{1+\beta}}{1+\beta} > 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Now consider the derivative of g_i and let $\underline{x}_1$ and $\underline{\underline{x}}_1$ be such that $g_i(\underline{x}_1) = \xi_i(\rho)$ and $g_i(\underline{\underline{x}}_1) = \xi_i(2\rho)$. Therefore, $Dg_i(\underline{\underline{x}}_1) \geq Dg_i(x_1) - 2\rho_i^\beta$ and so

$$\xi_i(\rho_i) - \xi_i(2\rho_i) \geq \rho_i(|Dg_i(x_1)| - 2\widetilde{C}\rho_i^\beta),$$

and by (3.9),

$$\xi_i(\rho_i) \geq \rho_i |Dg_i(x_1)| - 2\widetilde{C}\rho_i^{1+\beta}. \tag{3.11}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi_i(\rho) &\leq |g_i(x_1)| + \rho_i |Dg_i(x_1)| + \frac{\widetilde{C}(\rho_i)^{1+\beta}}{1+\beta} && \text{by Lemma 3.5} \\
&\leq \xi_i(\rho_i) + 2\rho_i |Dg_i(x_1)| + \frac{2\widetilde{C}(\rho_i)^{1+\beta}}{1+\beta} && \text{by (3.10)} \\
&\leq 3\xi_i(\rho_i) + \rho_i^{1+\beta}\left(4\widetilde{C} + \frac{2\widetilde{C}}{1+\beta}\right) && \text{by (3.11)} \\
&\leq 3\xi_i(\rho_i) + \widetilde{K}_3\|g_i\|_\infty \\
&\leq \widetilde{K}\xi_i(\rho_i) && \text{by Lemma 3.7} \qquad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\widetilde{K} > 0$ independent of i.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and choose k_0 big enough such that

$$\|g_{k_0}\|_\infty < \varepsilon \widetilde{K}_1 \|g_{k_0}\|_\infty^{1/(1+\beta)} = \varepsilon\rho_i.$$

Let N large enough such that for all $n \geq N$, we have $f_1^n(\mathcal{J}) \subset B_{\rho_i}(x_1)$. Note that for all $x \in \Delta$,

$$\kappa'^{-1} \operatorname{diam}(f_1^n(\Delta))^{-1}(g_{k_0} \circ f_1^n)(x) \leq f_1^{-n} \circ g_{k_0} \circ f_1^n(x) \leq \kappa' \operatorname{diam}(f_1^n(\Delta))^{-1}(g_{k_0} \circ f_1^n)(x)$$

for some $\kappa' > 1$, independent of n, given by bounded distortion. Therefore, using (3.12) and defining $\kappa = \widetilde{K}\kappa'$ we obtain,

(3.13)
$$-\operatorname{diam}(f_1^n(\Delta))^{-1}\kappa^{-1}\xi_{k_0}(\rho) \geq f_1^{-n} \circ g_{k_0} \circ f_1^n(x_1) \geq -\operatorname{diam}(f_1^n(\Delta))^{-1}\kappa\xi_{k_0}(\rho).$$

Here the negative sign arises because $g_i(x_1) < 0$ and the absolute value is taken in the definition of ξ. Choosing $m_0 > N$ such that $\operatorname{diam}(f_1^{m_0}(\Delta))^{-1}\xi_{k_0}(\rho_i) < \varepsilon$, but $\operatorname{diam}(f_1^{m_0-1}(\Delta))^{-1}\xi_{k_0}(\rho_i) \geq \varepsilon$, equation (3.13) reduces to

$$-\kappa^{-1}\varepsilon \geq f_1^{-m_0} \circ g_{k_0} \circ f_1^{m_0}(x_1) \geq -\kappa\varepsilon. \tag{3.14}$$

Define inductively $\phi_0 = f_1^{m_0} \circ f_{v_{k_0}}^{-1}$ and $\phi_n = \phi_{n-1} \circ f_1^{-m_n} \circ f_{v_{k_n}}^{-1}$, and $\psi_0 = f_{w_{k_0}} \circ f_1^{m_0}$ and $\psi_n = f_{w_{k_n}} \circ f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1}$ for some sequences $(m_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(k_n)_{n\geq 1}$ we will define later. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_n \circ \psi_n - \phi_{n-1} \circ \psi_{n-1} &= \phi_{n-1} \circ f_1^{-m_n} \circ f_{v_{k_n}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_n}} \circ f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} - \phi_{n-1} \circ f_1^{-m_n} \circ f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} \\
&= \zeta_{k_n} \cdot \left(f_{v_{k_n}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_n}} \circ f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} - f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} \right) \\
&= \zeta_{k_n} \cdot \left(\left[f_{v_{k_n}}^{-1} \circ f_{w_{k_n}} - \mathrm{Id} \right] \circ f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} \right) \\
&= \zeta_{k_n} \cdot (g_{k_n} \circ f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_{k_n} : [\Delta]_\delta \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function with derivative

$$D\zeta_{k_n} \asymp \operatorname{diam}\left(f_1^{m_n} \circ \phi_{n-1}^{-1}(\Delta) \right)^{-1} \asymp \operatorname{diam}\left(f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} \right)^{-1}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
-\operatorname{diam}\left(f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} \right)^{-1} \kappa^{-1}\xi_{k_n}(\rho) &\geq (\phi_n \circ \psi_n - \phi_{n-1} \circ \psi_{n-1})(x_1) \\
&\geq -\operatorname{diam}\left(f_1^{m_n} \circ \psi_{n-1} \right)^{-1} \kappa\xi_{k_n}(\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

We can now choose k_n and m_n in a similar fashion to (3.14) and get,

$$-\kappa^{-1}\varepsilon \geq (\phi_n \circ \psi_n - \phi_{n-1} \circ \psi_{n-1})(x_1) \geq -\kappa\varepsilon. \tag{3.15}$$

For the last ingredient we need to introduce a new notion of weak tangents.

Definition 3.8. *Let $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact, $[K]_\varepsilon$ denote the closed ε-neighbourhood of K, we write $d_{\mathcal{H}}^l(K_1, K_2)$ for the* left sided Hausdorff distance *between two sets K_1 and K_2, given by*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}^l(K_1, K_2) = \inf\{\varepsilon \geq 0 \mid K_1 \subseteq [K_2]_\varepsilon\}.$$

Definition 3.9. *Let $E, \widehat{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact. Let $(T_i)_i$ be a sequence of bi-Lipschitz maps*

$$\alpha_i^{-1}|x - y| \leq |T_i(x) - T_i(y)| \leq \alpha_i|x - y|,$$

satisfying $1 \leq \alpha_i < \alpha < \infty$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. If $d_{\mathcal{H}}^l(\widehat{E}, T_i(E)) \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$, we call $\widehat{E}$ a very weak pseudo tangent *of E.*

We note that very weak tangents (full Hausdorff distance converges to 0) and weak pseudo tangents ($\alpha_i = 1$ and left sided Hausdorff distance converges to 0) have been introduced in Fraser [7] and Fraser et al. [8], respectively. Very weak pseudo tangents are a generalisation of both of these types of tangents and we obtain the same useful bound.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\widehat{E}$ be a very weak pseudo tangent to E, then* $\dim_A \widehat{E} \leq \dim_A E$.

Our proof closely follows the argument in [8], and we only sketch some details.

Proof. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact and set $s = \dim_A E$, then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists constant C_ε such that for all $0 < r < R$,

$$\sup_{x\in E} N_r(B(x,r)\cap E) \leq C_\varepsilon (R/r)^{s+\varepsilon}.$$

Now T_i is bi-Lipschitz map such that $\underline{\alpha} \leq \alpha_i \leq \overline{\alpha}$ for some $0 < \underline{\alpha} \leq \overline{\alpha} < \infty$. Therefore

$$\sup_{x\in E} N_r(B(x,r)\cap T_i E) \leq C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha} R}{\underline{\alpha} r}\right)^{s+\varepsilon} = C'_\varepsilon (R/r)^{s+\varepsilon},$$

for some $C'_\varepsilon > 0$, independent of i. Now choose i large enough such that $d^l_{\mathcal{H}}(\widehat{E}, T_i(E)) < r$, thus a minimal cover for $T_i(E)$ can be extended to a cover of $\widehat{E}$ by covering the r-neighbourhood of every r-ball with c^d balls of radius r. We have

$$\sup_{x\in E} N_r(B(x,r)\cap \widehat{E}) \leq c^d \sup_{x\in E} N_r(B(x,r)\cap T_i(E)) \leq c^d C'_\varepsilon (R/r)^{s+\varepsilon}.$$

So $\dim_A \widehat{E} \leq s+\varepsilon$, and as ε was arbitrary the required conclusion follows. □

We conclude the proof by showing that $[0,1]$ is a very weak pseudo tangent of F, using the construction in (3.15). Let $\varepsilon_i = 1/(\kappa i)$ and define $\mathcal{F}_i = \{\phi_n \circ \psi_n(x_1) : 0 \leq n < i\} \cup \{x_1\}$. Consider

$$\mathcal{F}_i^* = \{\phi_{i-1} \circ f_\omega(x_1) : \omega \in \Lambda^*\},$$

Clearly, for every $0 \leq l \leq i-1$,

$$u_l = v_{k_{i-1}} 1^{m_{i-1}} v_{k_{i-2}} 1^{m_{i-2}} \dots v_{k_{l+1}} 1^{m_{l+1}} w_{k_l} 1^{m_l} w_{k_{l-1}} \dots 1^{m_1} w_{k_0} 1^{m_0} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}},$$

and $\phi_{i-1} = f_q$ for $q = 1^{-m_0} v_{k_0}^{-1} \dots 1^{-m_{i-1}} v_{k_{i-1}}^{-1}$.

We conclude

$$q u_l = \underbrace{1^{-m_0} v_{k_0}^{-1} \dots 1^{-m_l} v_{k_l}^{-1}}_{\text{word of } \phi_l} \underbrace{w_{k_l} 1^{m_l} w_{k_{l-1}} \dots 1^{m_1} w_{k_0} 1^{m_0}}_{\text{word of } \psi_l},$$

and so $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_i^*$. We define $T_i = \phi_{i-1}$, then

$$T_i F \supseteq \mathcal{F}_i^* \supseteq \mathcal{F}_i = \{\phi_n \circ \psi_n(x_1) : 0 \leq n < i\} \cup \{x_1\}.$$

Applying (3.15) gives us

$$-\kappa^{-1}\varepsilon_i \geq \phi_n \circ \psi_n - \phi_{n-1} \circ \psi_{n-1}(x_1) \geq -\kappa \varepsilon_i,$$

for all $0 \leq n < i$ and so $d^l_{\mathcal{H}}([0,1], T_i(F)) \leq 1/i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Since ϕ_i is a bi-Lipschitz map with bounded distortion, T_i is bi-Lipschitz and α_i is bounded. Therefore, applying Lemma 3.10, the required conclusion, $\dim_A F \geq \dim_A [0,1] = 1$, follows. □

References

[1] P. Assouad. Espaces métriques, plongements, facteurs, *Thèse de doctorat d'État, Publ. Math. Orsay 223–7769, Univ. Paris XI, Orsay*, (1977).

[2] P. Assouad. Étude d'une dimension métrique liée à la possibilité de plongements dans $\mathbb{R}^n$, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, **288**, (1979), 731–734.

[3] K. J. Falconer. Dimensions and measures of quasi self-similar sets, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **106**, (1989), 543–554.

[4] K. J. Falconer. *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, John Wiley, 3rd Ed., 2014.

[5] K. J. Falconer. *Techniques in Fractal Geometry*, John Wiley, 1997.

[6] M. A. Ferrari and P. Panzone. Separation properties for iterated function systems of bounded distortion, *Fractals*, **19**, (2011), 259–269.

[7] J. M. Fraser. Assouad type dimensions and homogeneity of fractals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **366**, (2014), 6687–6733.

[8] J. M. Fraser, A. M. Henderson, E. J. Olson and J. C. Robinson. On the Assouad dimension of self-similar sets with overlaps, *Adv. Math.*, **273**, (2015), 188–214.

[9] J. E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self-similarity, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **30**, (1981), 713–747.
[10] A. Käenmäki and E. Rossi. Weak separation condition, Assouad dimension, and Furstenberg homogeneity, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, to appear, arXiv:1506.07851v2.
[11] K.-S. Lau and S.-M. Ngai. Multifractal measures and a weak separation condition, *Adv. Math.*, **141**, (1999), 45–96.
[12] K.-S. Lau, S.-M. Ngai and X.-Y. Wang. Separation conditions for conformal iterated function systems, *Monatsh. Math.*, **156**, (2009), 325–355.
[13] J. Luukkainen. Assouad dimension: antifractal metrization, porous sets, and homogeneous measures, *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, **35**, (1998), 23–76.
[14] J. M. Mackay and J. T. Tyson. *Conformal dimension. Theory and application*, University Lecture Series, 54. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
[15] S.-M. Ngai and J.-X. Tong. Infinite iterated function systems with overlaps, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, to appear.
[16] Y. Peres, M. Rams, K. Simon and B. Solomyak. Equivalence of positive Hausdorff measure and the open set condition for self-conformal sets, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **129**, (2001), 2689–2699.
[17] Y. Pesin. *Dimension theory in dynamical systems*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, University of Chicago Press, 1997.
[18] J. C. Robinson. *Dimensions, Embeddings, and Attractors*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
[19] M. P. W. Zerner. Weak separation properties for self-similar sets, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **124**, (1996), 3529–3539.

Jasmina Angelevska, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje, Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Arhimedova 3, 1000 Skopje, FYROM.
E-mail address: jasmina.angelevska@hotmail.com

Sascha Troscheit, Mathematical Institute, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 9SS, UK.
E-mail address: s.troscheit@st-andrews.ac.uk
URL: http://www.mcs.st-andrews.ac.uk/~st76/